



The King's Cross Partnership
Monitoring and Evaluation Study

Report on the Survey of Households in King's Cross, 2000

*Dr Emmanuel Mutale and
Michael Edwards*

With assistance in survey and analysis work from: Musa Ndengu, Helia Evans, Joseph Lungu, Joram Odus, Omar Karshe, Shahid Hassain, Olga Hoque, Altaf Hossain, Shamsul Khan, Apollo Arikod, Marijn Fraanje, Helena Rostedt, Wilfredo De Vera, Abdel Erraou

The Bartlett School of Planning
University College London
22 Gordon Street, WC1H 0QB
020 7679 7501
m.edwards@ucl.ac.uk; e.mutale@ucl.ac.uk
June 2002

Contents

Contents	2
1. Purpose and structure of the report	3
1.1 The monitoring and evaluation study at King's Cross	3
1.2 Aims of the household survey.....	3
1.3 Scope.....	3
1.4 Method and approach.....	4
1.5 Summary of Sample Profile	5
Presentation of results in this report.....	7
2. Type of accommodation, tenure and housing conditions.....	8
2.1 Dwellings and tenure	8
2.2 The Right To Buy (RTB)	10
2.3 Length of residence	10
2.4 Crowding, sharing and space	12
2.5 Intentions to move or to stay.....	19
3 Qualifications and language skills	25
4 Economic activity.....	29
4.1 Unemployment measures.....	29
4.2 Employment and training experiences	30
4.3 Seeking employment and training	34
5 Industry and Occupation	46
5.1 Employment by sector	46
5.2 Employment by occupation.....	47
5.3 Travel to Work Patterns	48
5.4 Employee/Self-employed.....	49
6 Health and disability	56
7 Education and children.....	61
8 Crime and Security.....	77
8.1 Feelings about crime and safety.....	77
8.2 Actual behaviour	91
8.3 Actual experience of crime	93
9 Income and Benefits.....	97
10 The King's Cross Partnership.....	99
11 Perception of change between 1996-2000	104
References	113

1. Purpose and structure of the report

1.1 *The monitoring and evaluation study at King's Cross*

The research team at the Bartlett School of Planning, University College London, was commissioned by The King's Cross Partnership (KCP) to undertake a four-year programme of research evaluating and monitoring the process of urban regeneration in the area.

The distinctive features of this research programme are

- (i) that it seeks to make good, so far as possible, the lack of an adequate 'baseline' of information about the area, its people and its activity at the time when the SRB started work in 1996;
- (ii) it sets out to record and understand the processes of social and economic change going on in the area over the period and, as far as possible, identify the extent to which changes can be attributed to the actions of the Partnership (rather than to all the other diverse forces affecting the area);
- (iii) the core of the work, as originally planned, comprises two cycles of survey work, the first in 2000/1 and the second in 2002/3, reporting finally in September 2003.

A series of reports is now complete. This one is essentially a statement of the main findings of the survey of households carried out, with the help of a team of locally-recruited and -trained interviewers, during the year 2000. It has the character of a reference manual: presenting the main findings with a minimal amount of interpretation and very little discussion of the policy implications of the results. A draft version was submitted in summer 2001 and this version incorporates comments from the Partnership and from others in the intervening period.

Also complete is a similar report on the other survey – of employers in the area. Fieldwork for this survey has been done in 2001 and analysis completed in 2001/2. Because the Partnership has not seen interim draft of that report (though it has had the benefit of interim results and data), the employer survey report is labelled 'draft' at this stage.

The findings of these two surveys will be subject to interpretation and a discussion of their policy implications in the final report of this cycle which will also relate the data to other statistical and qualitative information about the area during the 1990s.

All of these reports will be paralleled by short summary versions, written in highly accessible language and with maximum use of charts and diagrams - suitable for wide distribution. The full, more technical and detailed, reports will be available for staff and Board members. All the reports would be made available in libraries and electronically once they have been cleared by the Board.

1.2 *Aims of the household survey*

The household survey 2000 aimed

- to provide types of data necessary to make up for the absence of a full baseline survey of the SRB area at inception
- to provide a datum against which change can be judged through a second survey in 2002.

1.3 *Scope*

The survey covers

- Descriptive variables on demography, family structure, employment, skills, economic position, housing
- Data on experience of, and feelings about, crime
- Attitudinal information on how people feel about the area, recent changes in the area and on their plans and hopes

- Some information on the Partnership and people's experience of it.

1.4 Method and approach

The household survey was planned (as part of our original research design) as a systematic sample survey of the SRB area's resident population. Great care was taken to ensure that the initial sample of addresses was drawn randomly, since only in this way can one have the greatest confidence that the results are representative of the population as a whole.

The approach was to draw a sample from the most up-to-date available listing of postal addresses, supplied by the Royal Mail (via LBI and LBC) as at early 2000.

This list has advantages and disadvantages:

On the positive side it is supposedly up to date and should include all residential premises (including those whose occupants are missing from the electoral register). On the negative side, it turned out to be inaccurate in two main ways: some multi-occupied buildings and sub-divided houses were listed just once (with the risk that dwellings in such buildings would be under-represented) and some of the premises listed turned out to be in business use. This introduced some delay while the lists were 'cleaned up'. It proved necessary to pound the streets, cross-checking the lists against actual buildings, numbers of door-bells and apparent occupiers in order to improve the accuracy of the listing before sampling could proceed.

A systematic sample was then drawn from the revised lists of addresses. Letters were mailed to batches of about a hundred addresses at a time, to advise householders that the survey was taking place and that an interviewer would call (Appendix 1). Some recipients responded by telephoning or emailing for an appointment.

As envisaged in the research proposal, strong efforts were made to recruit local people – especially those who might most need the training and the work – as interviewers. Recruiting took place through "Tracks" – which proved not very fast or effective – and through the Job Centre – which yielded most of our trainees. We started with 6 recruits selected from among the applicants and took on a further 5 at later stages.

Interviewers were trained through initial classroom briefings, followed by supervised mock interviews with each other (using the actual questionnaire), followed by supervised real interviews as they began their field work, and followed up by de-briefing on completed survey forms. In addition the interviewers were recalled for a number of collective de-briefings which both helped to pool experiences about the survey and to identify ambiguous questions etc which required revision.

Our experience is that we were able to recruit some excellent interviewers and we wish to thank them for their powerful contribution. We should, however, point out that our main recruitment problem was the 'benefit trap': these jobs had been designed to attract unemployed people who were looking for a way back into work and training and as a bridge to more permanent employment. In fact many people who showed an interest did not join us because they would have had to discontinue their benefits - and perhaps not be much better off financially - and then face the protracted process of making a new benefit claim after their survey work was over. This is a well-known problem, and one of the impediments to lowering unemployment levels which we shall be discussing in the reports.

1.5 Summary of Sample Profile

Out of a total sample of 700 households, 327 took part in our survey - representing a response rate of 47%. Information was collected on 796 individuals in 327 households. In this section we present the characteristics of the households who took part in our survey.

Ethnicity

The 1991 census estimated a resident population of 15,900 of whom 33% were from ethnic minority groups. Table 1.1 shows a population and sample breakdown of the various ethnic groups.

Table 1.1 : Population and sample breakdown of ethnic groups

Group	Approximate % population within SRB area(1991 Census)	% individuals in sample with % of households in brackets
White	67	46 (62)
Irish	6	--
Black-Caribbean	3	4 (6)
Black-African	5	8 (6)
Black-Other	2	2 (2)
Indian	1	0 (0)
Bangladeshi	9	17 (9)
Chinese	2	3 (2)
Asian	2	--
Other	2	10 (12)
Unstated	-	10 (0)
Total Population (1991 Census)	99	100 (99)

Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000 and 1991 Census

Length of residence

Respondents were asked to say how long they, and where applicable, their partner had lived at the address. Table 1.2 is a summary of this information grouped into three categories thus:

- Those resident up to 2 years - recent
- Those resident 3 to 9 years - medium term
- Those resident 10 years and more - long term

Table 1.2 : Length of residence

Length of residence	% of individuals in sample
Recent arrivals	27
Medium-term	31
Long-term	42
N = 386	

Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Tenure

The housing tenure characteristics of our sample showed a concentration in four groups (Table 1.3).

Table 1.3 : Housing Tenure

Tenure	% of households in sample
Owner-occupiers	17
Council	45
Housing Association	24
Private rent from individual	9
Employer of household member	1
Another organisation	2
Relative/Friend of household member	1
Live here rent free	1
N = 327	100

Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Age-group

The age profile shows 75% of people our sample were less than 50 years old and 21% were aged 50 and over (Table 1.4).

Table 1.4 : Age-group

Age-group (years)	% individuals in sample
0-9	18
10-19	12
20-29	18
30-39	17
40-49	10
50-59	8
60-69	6
70-79	6
80+	1
Age not stated	4
N = 796	100

Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Gender

In gender terms our sample was almost evenly balanced although there were a few more females than males (Table 1.5).

Table 1.5 : Gender

Gender	% individuals in sample
Male	45
Female	51
Gender not stated	3
N = 796	99

Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Size and number of households

Table 1.6 : Household size and prevalence

No of people in household	No of households	% of households
1	124	38
2	83	25
3	47	14
4	33	10
5	23	7
6	6	2
7	7	2
8	4	1
Total	327	99

Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Presentation of results in this report

In most of the digrams in this report, we show breakdowns in the following sequence:

- the whole sample
- three main ethnic sub-groups
- recent arrivals / medium / long-term residents
- four main ten ure groupings

2. Type of accommodation, tenure and housing conditions

In this section we examine the prevalence of different house types, tenures and conditions prevailing in these tenures.

Presentation of results in this report:


In most of the diagrams in this report, we show breakdowns in the following sequence:

- the whole sample
- three main ethnic sub-groups
- recent arrivals / medium / long-term residents
- four main tenure groupings

2.1 Dwellings and tenure

Figure 2.1 shows that the predominant dwelling type was the purpose built flat which accounted for 70% of all housing units in the area. The others are almost all either terraced houses or houses subdivided into flats.

Figure 2.1: Type of Dwelling



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

The two local authorities (Camden and Islington) owned 46% of the housing units while housing associations and private owners accounted for the rest - 27% and 8% respectively (Table 2.1).


Table 2.1: Households and Tenure 1991 and 2000

Tenure	1991 census % of households	2000 survey % of households
Owner occupied	16	14
Council rented	61	46
Housing Association rented	14	27
Private rented	10	8

Source: King's Cross Household Survey 2000 and 1991 Census

The breakdown of tenure for the three main ethnic groups showed that, with 21% owner occupiers, White households were up to 20 times more likely to own their house than Black or Bangladeshi households among whom the rate of ownership was only 3% and 1% respectively. Ethnic minority households were more likely to be public sector tenants with up to 95% of Black and 90% of Bangladeshi households citing the Local Authority or Housing Association as their landlord compared to 60% of White households (Figure 2.2).

Figure 2.2: Tenure Groups




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Home ownership and council tenancy increased with length of stay, hence, the proportion of owners and of council tenants was higher among long-term residents than medium-term and for them in turn higher than among recent arrivals, who were most likely to be private tenants. However, there does not seem to be a strong link between length of stay and Housing Association tenancy. This might be explained by differences in allocation procedures (between local authorities and Housing Associations) and the interaction between the nature of housing market processes and individual choices. For example, Camden's allocations policy and the homelessness legislation both favour households living in the borough (LBC, 1999). On the other hand, 22% of recent arrivals were housed in private rent compared with only 5% of medium-term and 2% of long-term residents.

2.2 The Right To Buy (RTB)

Owner-occupiers were also asked about the previous ownership of the house. Figure 2.3 shows that 63% of the owner-occupiers had bought or were in the process of buying their house from the Council under the Right To Buy (RTB) compared to only 2% through the Housing Association RTB. A further 28% had bought or were buying privately with White households being far more likely to buy privately (32%) compared to 8% among the Black and zero among the Bangladeshi households. The restricted access to the private housing market suffered by ethnic minority households was to some extent made up for by the RTB facility. Of the owner-occupier households, proportionately more (88%) Bangladeshi and Black (77%) households said that they bought or were buying their house through the council RTB than among the White households (59%). When the analysis was extended to take account of length of residence, we found that among long-term residents the proportion of the owner-occupiers who had bought from the council was almost four times as high (76%) as the proportion who had bought on the private market. These respective proportions begin to converge with a reduction in length of residence to 57% and 31% among the medium-term residents. A complete convergence occurs among the recent arrivals with 41% owner-occupiers having bought or buying their house through the council RTB and another 41% citing a private market transaction. What we see here is the progressive weakening of a regulated housing market through RTB, leading to a convergence with an open housing market situation - hence the current situation in which new home owners are as likely to buy a house from an individual on the open market as through the RTB scheme.

Figure 2.3: Previous ownership of owner-occupied units




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

2.3 Length of residence

Although the area is distinctive for its rapidly changing population, our survey showed that there was a settled community which had lived in this area for more than 10 years, often much longer. Figure 2.4 shows that, of all the sample households, 27% were recent arrivals (up to 2 years) another 31% were medium-term residents (3 to 9 years) and 42% had lived in the area for longer than 10 years. Disaggregated according to ethnicity, we found that White households were most

likely to be long-term residents. Bangladeshi households were likely to be medium- or long-term residents, and Black households were most likely to be recent- or medium-term residents. An observation already made is the decreasing proportion of owner-occupiers and council tenants with decreasing length of residence. There were proportionately more in both those tenures among long-term residents than among recent arrivals for whom the predominant tenure was private rent from individuals. For example, within the owner-occupier group, the proportion dropped from 54% who were long-term residents to 17% who were recent arrivals. Among council tenants, half (50%) were long-term residents and only 18% recent arrivals. On the other hand, the proportion within the private rent sector rose from 12% who were long term residents to 70% who were recent arrivals.

Figure 2.4: Length of residence




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

When age was taken into account, length of residence was polarised at the two ends with 58% of those aged 15-29 years being in recently arrived households compared to only 5% for the over 60s. At the other end of the age scale, 87% of those aged over 60 were long-term resident households while the proportion in the 15-29 age group was 15%.

2.4 Crowding, sharing and space

Occupancy ratios (number of people divided by habitable rooms) were calculated to give an indication of the level of crowding. Figure 2.5 shows occupancy ratios of 1.49 or better for 91% of households in King's Cross with a mean of 0.7 people per habitable room. The most common experience being in the range 0.50-0.99, i.e. between one and two rooms per person. However, such broad classifications and averages mask a considerable concentration of high occupancy ratios in certain groups. Disaggregated on ethnicity for example, we found that while 46% of Bangladeshi households had occupancy ratios of worse than 1.49, the proportion within the Black households was 14% and a mere 2% among the White households.

Figure 2.5: Occupancy ratio



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Occupancy ratio improved with increasing length of stay. Thus recent arrivals were more likely to be crowded than medium-term residents who in turn were more crowded than long-established residents. In terms of tenure, residents were likely to be more crowded in council housing followed by housing associations, owner occupied and private renting.

Based on the 1991 census (King's Cross Facts), the percentage of households with a greater than 1 occupancy ratio in the SRB area was 9% while those under 0.5 was 33%. Our survey (Table 2.2) shows that 34% of households had fewer than 0.5 persons to a room (the same as the 1991 ratio of 33%) and that 27% of households had more than 1 person to a room. This suggests a three-fold increase in the proportion of households described as overcrowded and confirms the presence of a settled community in part of the housing stock alongside another part of the stock in which there is turnover, growth and some serious overcrowding.


Table 2.2: Occupancy ratios 1991 and 2000

Occupancy Ratio	1991 census (% of Households)	2000 survey (% of Households)
>1= Crowded	9	27
<0.5 = Underoccupation	33	34

Source: King's Cross Household Survey 2000 and 1991 Census

In addition to establishing the level of overcrowding using occupancy ratios, we also asked respondents questions about their housing needs and plans. Overall, 19% reported that they did not have enough bedrooms (Figure 2.6). The need was more acute within the ethnic minority groups with 26% of Black and 57% of Bangladeshi households saying they did not have enough bedrooms. When analysed against tenure, this need was highest among those in Housing Association units (27%) followed by Council units (22%).

Figure 2.6: Perceptions on housing adequacy




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Analysing occupancy rates only for those households reporting that they did not have enough bedrooms revealed that while the mean occupancy within this group was 1.33 (compared to 0.70 for all households and 0.55 for those saying they had enough bedrooms), a small proportion of

households with occupancy rates of less than 1 were also to be found (Figure 2.7). Some of these households cited visits from children and grand children as reasons for wanting more room even though the question referred to those people permanently resident at the address.


Figure 2.7: Occupancy ratios - inadequately housed respondents



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

For those (19%) considering themselves inadequately housed, the need was mostly clustered around 2-5 bedroom dwellings, with the highest need being for 3 bedroom houses (Figure 2.8). Disaggregated by ethnicity, the need for much larger dwellings (i.e. 4 bedrooms or more) was highest among the Bangladeshis, followed closely by the Black and then by White households.


Figure 2.8: Self-reported housing need



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 2.9 shows the actual number of bedrooms in the household units reporting a deficiency in bedrooms. Notice that, at the time of the survey, most of them were housed in 1-3 bedroom flats rather than 2-5 bedrooms.


Figure 2.9: Number of bedrooms occupied now by inadequately housed respondents



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Those stating that they did not have enough bedrooms were further asked how they coped. Figure 2.10 shows some of the ways overcrowded households have managed their housing need. These have ranged from using the living room as sleeping space (16%) to sharing bedrooms (46%) and sometimes children sharing with parents (27%).


Figure 2.10: Coping arrangements among inadequately housed families



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Although relatively rare, multiple occupancy, especially among the recent arrivals, was a feature of King's Cross housing conditions with 8% of households interviewed sharing a bath, shower or toilet with another household. While there was no multiple occupation among Bangladeshi households - largely owing to the already large families- the rate was 7% among the White and 13% among the Black households. Examined by tenure, multiple occupancy was prevalent in privately rented units (Figure 2.11).

Figure 2.11: Multiple Occupancy




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

2.5 Intentions to move or to stay

Households were further asked if they had any plans to move, and if so where they wanted to go and for what reasons. A significant 30% said that they had plans to move house and (presumably reflecting the housing experiences and conditions of the different ethnic groups and tenures) this intention was most common among the Bangladeshi (61% of them) and Black (36%) households (Figure 2.12). More households in private rental (39%) and Housing Associations (36%) had plans to move than those in owner-occupied and council units. Invariably, the propensity to want to move was greater among the young (15-29) followed by the middle-aged (30-59) as can be seen in Figure 2.12.


Figure 2.12: Intentions to move or stay



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

On the whole, Figure 2.13 shows that there were as many households whose plans were to move to other rented units (47% of those considering a move) as those wanting to buy their own (44%). When these intentions were analysed against other variables, there were twice as many intending to move-to-rent in the Bangladeshi and Black households as there were within the White households. A higher proportion (58%) of White households who planned to move had plans to buy their own home compared to 26% within the Bangladeshi and 21% within the Black population. Notably all 12 of the owner-occupier households considering moving wanted to rent their next dwelling.


Figure 2.13: Preferred tenure of those considering moving



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Even though about a third of households wanted to move, there was still an appeal about the area with 56% of the intending movers saying they preferred to live within King's Cross compared to 44% who wanted to go elsewhere (Figure 2.14).


Figure 2.14: Preferred area of those considering moving



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Those wanting to move out of the area gave a variety of reasons, which we have classified into four categories: family, environment, economic and health/social. Figure 2.15 shows the number of times reasons in each of these broad categories were mentioned and Table 2.3 gives a fuller flavour of the detailed reasons within the four broad classifications. Those intending to move out were mostly concerned about the general physical environment followed by family, health and social reasons, and finally economic concerns.

Figure 2.15: Main reasons for wanting to move out of the area



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Table 2.3: Typical reasons given by the households who want to move out of King's Cross


Family	Environment	Economic	Health/Social
Overcrowded, want to buy another house	Asthmatic and allergic to fumes	Too expensive	Too many fights; arguments with neighbours
Family in Barnet and Finchley Get near daughter and grandchildren	Infected with mice and rats A lot of noise	End of contract - no job Rent is too high. Want a council flat	Too many ethnics Too much racism
To be close to my mother	Not nice for kids. Not a nice area	Seek lower council tax	Quality of education is poor
Prefer to bring up family in rural area	I want a garden, balcony, garage, nicer area of London	Rent arrears. Forced to pay £100 while I only get £150. How do I feed my children?	Corruption and overpopulated
No gardens here	Area is rough		Drugs, prostitution, no police
Flat too small	Don't like the area, prefer countryside		Not safe
I would like to be independent	House is near busy road		Cannot climb stairs
	Streets are dirty and filthy and no parking		Just fed up with the area

Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000. See notes overleaf

Notes to table 2.3 above: Of all households, 29% planned to move; just under half of these (44%) wanted to move out of the King's Cross area. Each column is a separate list: read down, not across.

Although the regeneration programme in King's Cross seeks to tackle the complex physical, economic and social challenges in the area, the original fund allocation embodied a priority towards physical regeneration with 42% of original SRB funding allocated to this aspect of the programme. When our sample households were asked for reasons why they wanted to move out of the area - the "push" factors - it transpired that the one most common reason given was the poor environmental quality of the area. This question was immediately followed by one which sought to find out why people had decided to come and live in the area - the "pull" factors. Figure 2.16 shows that while location - understood here to mean an easily accessible place - was a strong 'pull' factor for 27% of all respondents, in over 50% of cases our households felt they had no choice of where to live. In particular, 33% of respondents said that they were allocated the dwelling by the council and had no choice except to take it. (It may well be the case that the local authority does not make more than one offer at a time, and if this is so, desperate households have felt under pressure to take the first offer even if there was a chance for a second offer should the first be turned down.) In another 21% of cases respondents reported that they were born here - implying no choice in the matter. There was a strong tendency among the Black and Bangladeshi households to report that they had been allocated the house by the council and had no choice. In contrast, for White households, the main reason given for having no choice was that they were born in the area.

Figure 2.16: Reasons for deciding to live in the area



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


When the 27% of cases where location was the determining factor were disaggregated on a number of variables, it was found that these were most likely to be White (30%) or Black (22%) households, recent (36%) to medium-term (31%) residents. In addition they were likely to be in private rent (61%) or owner occupation (49%), young adults (38%) or middle-aged (28%) and male (33%) more than female.

3 Qualifications and language skills

A careful audit of the qualifications and skills of local people has the potential to indicate the extent to which the new jobs being created in King's Cross, or in wider areas, match the pool of labour available and hence find ways of getting the local unemployed and under-employed back to work or working in better jobs.

Our analysis of the household data shows that 40% had poor or no GCSEs, 13% had good GCSEs (5 or more A-C), 16% were educated to A level standard and 31% were educated to degree or higher level (Figure 3.1). (For older residents, GCE 'O Levels' are recorded).

Figure 3.1: Highest qualification of household members



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Educational qualifications were lowest within the Bangladeshi community among whom 73% had no or poor GCSEs compared to 35% and 33% within the White and Black communities respectively. The Black community had a higher proportion of highly educated people with 41% educated to degree level or higher compared to 33% within the White and only 7% within the Bangladeshi communities.


When analysed against length of residence, an inverse relationship emerged: the longer the length of stay, the less qualified people were likely to be, and vice versa. For example, Figure 3.1 shows that substantially more (53%) long-term residents had poor or no GCSEs compared to the medium-term (38%) and recent arrivals (17%).

Notice again in Figure 3.1 that while 73% of the people aged 60 years or above had poor or no GCSEs or their earlier equivalents, there was a considerable proportion (38%) within the 30-59 and 23% within the 15-29 age group with poor or no GCSEs. There is a slight difference by gender: 35% males were poorly educated compared to 44% of the females. A similar picture

emerged at the other end with 36% of males educated to degree or higher level against 27% of females.


In terms of English language skills, the general picture was that 12% of all the population reported difficulty in speaking, reading, writing and understanding English. The proportion was much higher in the Bangladeshi community where the average proportion in all 4 aspects of the English language was about 36% followed by the Black (13%) and White (3%)(Figure 3.2a-d). While recent arrivals and long-term residents generally seemed to be better in English skills, medium-term residents were poor at English - and this group contains a majority of the Bangladeshi population (Figure 2.4).

Figure 3.2a: Problems with speaking English




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 3.2b: Problems with reading English




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 3.2c: Problems with writing English



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 3.2d: Problems with understanding spoken English



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

4 Economic activity

4.1 Unemployment measures

Despite the widespread use of unemployment rates as a socio-economic indicator, the definition and measurement of employment, and especially of unemployment, remains a problem. Yet reliable measures of economic activity are essential to the proper evaluation of economic regeneration efforts. They not only tell us how many people work and in what jobs they are employed but also how many are unemployed. Labour studies conventionally sub-divide the adult population into three groups (Thomas, 2000; Green and Owen, 1998):

- The employed - those in a paid job as employees or self-employed, or those on government-sponsored training and employment schemes;
- The unemployed - those not in a job but actively looking and available for work; and
- The inactive - all other members of the adult population

A number of measures are used to calculate the rate of unemployment: below are the two most commonly used in the UK:

Claimant Count measure of unemployment

Up to October 1982, Local unemployment records represented people who had registered as unemployed at local employment offices or careers offices. From October 1982, the system changed to record claimants at unemployment benefit offices, but still apportioned to boroughs according to where the claim was made. The Employment Service later introduced a system of coding the place of residence of claimants (by postcode) and assigning them to wards (ONS Employment Information Unit). The Claimant Count therefore is a count by the Employment Service of all those people who are claiming unemployment-related benefits and are fit and available for work. Unemployment rates using the claimant count refer to the percentage of economically active people who are registered as unemployed. The Claimant Count offers a direct and detailed analysis of unemployment at varying geographical scales.

The International Labour Office (ILO) measure of unemployment


ILO definition of unemployment refers to people without a job who were looking for a job or training in the last four weeks and who would be able to start work in the two weeks. This self-identified unemployment is a better measure, as it does not rely on the respondents' eligibility for unemployment benefit. Unemployment rates using the ILO measure refer to the percentage of economically active people who are unemployed regardless of whether they claim unemployment benefit or not. This is the same measure used in Britain by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) in its Labour Force Survey (LFS). However, because the LFS is a sample survey, there are limits on the size of the sample that can be meaningfully used to draw inferences on the population in local areas (say at borough level and lower). With national sample sizes of 60-80,000 this is considered too small to measure unemployment at a local level. The LFS figure for unemployment therefore, although a better measure, does not give a sufficiently precise estimate to show trends at borough level.

There are problems in the interpretation and use of either measure (Thomas, 2000) and the specific problems with the claimant count include (a) problems of comparison over time because the criteria for claiming have been tightened many times, (b) the tendency of many people who do want work not to register and (c) the fact that some people manage to claim while actually not being available for work, or working informally.

4.2 Employment and training experiences


Because of the problems of interpreting unemployment statistics, it is especially important to look also at the proportions of people who **are** in employment. The whole adult population in our survey (16 and above) was asked what they were doing in the week before the interview. Figures 4.1a-d show that 46% were in paid work while others were on training (6%) away from a job or business (4%) while another 3% were doing unpaid work. The proportion in paid work was highest for White (51%) followed by Black (44%) and Bangladeshi (30%) groups. This shows the variation of employment experience within the ethnic minority groups in which the Black population, although still falling behind the White population, enjoyed a higher employment rate than the Bangladeshis. In terms of age, the employment experience was almost the same between the youth (15-29) - in which 52% were in paid jobs - and the middle-aged (30-59) in which 55% were in paid jobs. When responses were disaggregated by gender, it was found that the proportion of paid workers within the male population was higher (56%) than within the female population (37%). There was a higher proportion of paid workers among the recent arrivals (47%) compared to the long-term residents (32%). The highest proportion of paid workers however was among the mid-term residents (60%).

Figure 4.1a: Household members in paid work




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 4.2b: Household members on government-sponsored job training




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 4.2c: Household members away from a job or business



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 4.2d: Household members doing unpaid work



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


There are a number of government sponsored training schemes in London designed to train people for jobs. A detailed analysis of the people (6%) on government employment training showed that while within the White and Bangladeshi community there were only 4-5% people on these schemes, the proportion within the Black community was 14% (Figure 4.2b). The concern here is the low up-take of these schemes among the Bangladeshis, among whom the unemployment rate was found to be high and among whom we would expect to see a concentration of training activity designed to help them access jobs. But, we are working with small numbers in our sample on this and further evidence may need to be sought.

In relation to age group (Figure 4.2b), the ratio of those on employment training was lower for the 15-29 (4%) compared to the 30-59 (10%). This might be explained by possible increases in the number of 16 year olds staying on for education (as distinct from employment training). In relation to gender, proportionately more males (7%) were on employment training compared to 3% females. When analysed against length of residence, it was found that the percentage of people in employment training was highest among the mid-term residents who also enjoyed high employment levels compared to the other two groups of residents - an observation already made above in relation to ethnicity. At this micro scale we generally see that the uptake of employment training was high in those groups in which employment experiences were also good.

Although we are talking about very small numbers on job training (17 in the whole sample), what was noticeable is that Black and Bangladeshi respondents were all on 'other training schemes' outside the mainstream government training provisions such as New Deal etc. (Figure 4.2e). It is

possible that these 'other training schemes' include KCP advice, guidance and job preparation training programmes which have been targeted at the most disadvantaged. To the extent that King's Cross training projects aim to complement, add value and close gaps in mainstream training provision in the area (Deborah Mclean, KCP Community Forum, May 2001), it could be argued that the Partnership is making progress towards this objective. For example, over 80% of new entrants on the Vocational Training Project were reported to come from minority ethnic groups, as were over 50% of those progressing into employment (Philip Morris, End of Year 5 Key Indicators report, April 2001).

Figure 4.2e: Participation in job training schemes (analysis of 17 cases only)




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

4.3 Seeking employment and training

Those not in a job (paid or unpaid), or not on job training were asked if they had been looking for paid work (or for a government training scheme) in the last 4 weeks (Figure 4.3): 13% of all respondents said that they were. In relation to ethnicity, the proportions within each group were 8% White, 24% Black and 22% Bangladeshi. The high proportion within the ethnic minority groups suggests high unemployment in these groups. By age group, the proportions were 15% (15-29) and 21% (30-59). There were significantly more people within the male population (20%) looking for a job or training compared to 8% within the female population. Almost all (91%) of the people looking for a job or for training indicated their availability to start within 2 weeks if the opportunity arose.


Figure 4.3: Looking for paid work or training



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Of those not seeking work or training within the last 4 weeks (or unable to start within 2 weeks), Figure 4.4 shows that the most common reasons given were that they had retired (31%), had family/home care commitments (20%), were students (18%) or sick/disabled (13%). A higher proportion (43%) within the non-working White community were retired compared to 11% Black and 15% Bangladeshi. On the other hand, 36% of Bangladeshi people were not looking for a job or training because of family/home care compared to 30% Black and only 16% White. These differences reflect in part the common practice within some ethnic minority groups of looking after the elderly in the family home rather than putting them in an institution and also the prevalence of young families with children within these groups. As would be expected there were far more people (58%) within the 15-29 range who were not working because they were students than in the older age-group of 30-59 (7%).

Figure 4.4: Main reason for not seeking work/training (all adults)




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Although there were more people in the older group not working because of keeping house (33%), there was also a substantial proportion (23%) within the younger age-group who were not available for work because of family and home care. In relation to gender 13% of the non-working female population gave the reason of being a student compared to 26% among the males. The burden of family/home care falls heavily on the women, among whom 27% did not seek work or were unable to start in 2 weeks time compared to 6% of men. There was a high proportion of family/home among the recent arrivals (37%), and 32% among the medium term residents compared to 9% for long-term residents. This does support the earlier observation of the high prevalence of home care in ethnic minority groups who would mainly be recent arrivals or medium term residents.

Registered unemployment

All unemployed adults were asked whether they were registered as unemployed so as to help determine the unemployment rate as defined by the claimant count. 28% of all adult respondents said that they were registered as unemployed. When disaggregated on ethnicity (Figure 4.5), the proportion of those registered unemployed within each group was found to be 19% of White, 47% of Black and 47% of Bangladeshi.


Figure 4.5: Registered unemployed



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

A further analysis (Figure 4.6) was made by selecting only those cases in which the people were aged between 15 and 59 - this effectively excluded most of those who are retired because of age. Within this group, the most prevalent reasons why people were not looking for a job or would not start within 2 weeks were family/home care (28%) or that they were students (28%) and those long-term sick or disabled (16%). Within the three main ethnic groups, 31% of Whites were not job-hunting or were unavailable to start work because they were students compared to 13% and 16% for the Black and Bangladeshi residents respectively.

Figure 4.6: Main reason for not seeking work/training (15-59 years)



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

A substantial proportion (36%) of Bangladeshi people were not available for work due to family or home care compared to 35% Black and 30% White. Interestingly, when those aged 60 and above were removed from the equation, family/home care showed up as a very significant reason among the working-age White population for not seeking or starting work. The inference to be drawn from this is that the majority of the people aged 60 and now excluded in this second analysis were White and their earlier inclusion served to disguise the importance of family/home care as a barrier to work/training for younger White families.

While it is now an established fact that girls perform better in GCSEs and A levels than boys, it is interesting that in King's Cross, there were more people among the male population not working

because they were students compared to the female population. It is possible that most girls do not go on to higher education or this is simply a reflection of a bias brought about by the fact that we mostly talked to those that were not at work or school. While this was so, we collected information on all adult members of the household whether present or not - thus minimising that particular source of bias. A further analysis of the student sub-group might be necessary before reaching solid conclusions. Predictably more of the female population were not looking for employment but staying at home to look after family compared to the male population.


There was, however, a big disparity between the proportion of people looking for work and those registered unemployed. In the whole adult sample (16+), 13% said they were looking for a job or training (Figure 4.3). If we limit the age range to 15-59, the proportion of people looking for work was 10%. On the other hand the proportions registered unemployed were found to be 28% (for all those aged 16+ see Figure 4.5) and 38% (for those aged between 15 and 59). In either case, the proportion of people reported to be registered unemployed was higher than those who said that were looking for work. It could be the case that only half of the registered unemployed were actively seeking work. It could also be true that respondents did not understand the difference between unemployment-related benefits and other benefits they might be receiving, and were thus recorded as claimants when in fact they were on some non-employment benefit. On the other hand, it could well be that there were people claiming unemployment-related benefits when they should not. If the claimant count (those registered as unemployed) was used as a measure of unemployment, our figures of 28% or 38% bear little relationship to the 2-6% for the 8 Camden Wards in and around King's Cross published by the Employment Service using the claimant count rate (those registered unemployed) for April 2000. It is of course possible that the claimant count on ward level smoothes out the extreme disparities that can be found at the level of smaller geographical areas. It is therefore difficult to reconcile these two statistics. The ILO measure might be useful in resolving this disparity.

ILO Unemployment

In order to estimate the rate of unemployment according to ILO guidelines, the household data was filtered to include all those seeking work/training in the last four weeks and able to start within two weeks. This yielded a total number of 30 from an adult population of 446 giving an ILO unemployment rate of 7%. This statistic is close to the 10% and 13% (see above) who said that they were looking for work/training but still far from the 28% and 38% (again see above) claiming that they were registered unemployed. We are inclined to accept the ILO 7% unemployment rate or the 10% and 13% (representing those looking for work or training) and reject the 28% and 38% (those registered unemployed) because of the possibility that most respondents had a poor understanding of the benefits received. At 7-13%, unemployment in King's Cross was about twice the average of the 8 Camden Wards within and around King's Cross in which the claimant count defined rate was 2-6%. It is however commonly accepted that the Employment Service claimant count rate under-estimates the level of real unemployment.

Although adults from Black and Bangladeshi households comprised about 15-16% of the sample, they accounted for 20-23% of the unemployed total in the sample and were therefore over-represented (Figure 4.7). On the other hand, the proportion of White adults in the sample was nearly 69% while their unemployed accounted for 37% of the total ILO unemployment.

Figure 4.7: Sample size and ILO unemployment




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

ILO Unemployment and Job Interviews

Cases defined as unemployed according to ILO guidelines were analysed to gain an understanding of their experiences in the job market. While 62% of all the ILO unemployed had attended one or more job interviews, thirty-eight per cent had had no job interviews in the last two years before this survey (Figure 4.8). Although we were dealing with small numbers (29 people in total), 3 out of 6 Bangladeshis hadn't been to a job interview in two years; similarly 2 out of 6 Blacks, and 4 out of 11 whites.


Figure 4.8: Number of job interviews (analysis of 29 individuals only)



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Asked about the last job interview, the 2 Bangladeshi unemployed said this was in the local area. On the other hand, Black (of whom there were 3) and White (4) had had the last job interview locally, within the borough and outside the borough (Figure 4.9). Although these numbers are too small, we can see that White and Black unemployed were perhaps more likely to look further afield for a job compared to Bangladeshi.


Figure 4.9: Place of last job interview (analysis 9 individuals only)



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Although unemployed at the time of this survey, forty-three percent of all unemployed said that they had been offered the job at the last interview (Figure 4.10) compared to 57% who hadn't.

Figure 4.10: Outcome of last job interview




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

The self-perceived problems in seeking work mainly related to a lack of educational and vocational qualifications and to a less extent by difficulties in reading or writing English (Figure 4.11a-e). When analysed by ethnic groups, English was, understandably, not a problem among the Whites but was a factor within the ethnic minority groups, especially the Black. In addition


lack of education and vocational qualifications appeared to be a severe problem among the Black households. But, recall that in Chapter 3, Figure 3.1 we said that there was a higher proportion of well educated people within the Black households. While this may be the case, there seem to be severe unemployment problems among those with poor or no educational and vocational qualifications in Black households. While there was a higher percentage (73% in Figure 3.1) with poor or no GCSEs within the Bangladeshi households, compared to 33% for Blacks, the unemployed Bangladeshis were less likely than Black people to think that lack of educational qualifications had caused them problems in seeking.

Figure 4.11a: Problems in seeking work because of lack of educational qualifications




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 4.11b: Problems in seeking work because of lack of vocational qualifications




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 4.11c: Problems in seeking work because of difficulties with reading/writing English




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 4.11d: Problems in seeking work because of difficulties with speaking English



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


Figure 4.11e: Problems in seeking work because of difficulties with understanding English



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

On the whole, respondents with no GCSEs were just as likely to be unemployed as those with a degree or higher degree (Figure 4.12). When the data was disaggregated to ethnic levels an interesting relationship was revealed. While the proportion of Black unemployment was slightly higher than White unemployment at degree level, the differential between the ethnic groups becomes worse as the level of qualification falls. What this suggests is that it is much harder for uneducated ethnic minority people to get a job than their White counterparts. On the other hand, the educated among the ethnic groups are able to compete reasonably well with their white counterparts.

Figure 4.12: Highest qualification of ILO unemployed




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

5 Industry and Occupation

5.1 Employment by sector

Table 5.1 shows that the employed were concentrated in particular sectors of industry. About one quarter (24%) of all employed people in King's Cross were in the business service sector, followed by 11% in retailing and 11% in community, social and personal activities other than those below. The next major employment sectors were hotels and restaurants (10%), health and social work (10%) and education (9%). The concentration of jobs in the business services sector mirrored that of the two boroughs of Camden and Islington both of which have high shares of business sector employment (Focus 1999).

Figure 5.1: Employment by sector




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 5.1 further shows that each ethnic group tended to be concentrated in particular sectors. For instance, 26% of all White people were employed in business activity as were 32% of all Black people. On the other hand 35% of all Bangladeshi were employed in hotels and restaurant. In terms of the spread of employment sectors, the White and Black population were working in a broader spread of sectors than the Bangladeshi. This might be a case of recruitment practices which reproduce the existing workforce characteristics and thus reinforce patterns of employment. When analysed by age group it was found that certain sectors employed significantly more of one group than another. For example, there were twice (16%) as many people among those aged 15-29 working in the hotels and restaurant sector than among the 30-59 (8%). There was also a tendency for proportionally more older people to work in the public administration and education sectors than among the young. Equally, women were more likely to work in education and health/social work and men in hotels/restaurants, transport and business activity.

5.2 Employment by occupation

The occupational distribution of the workforce in King's Cross (Figure 5.2) revealed a big concentration in personal and protective services (20%). There was also however a very significant clustering around the higher level managerial or professional occupations and noticeably fewer people in the low skilled and less well paid occupations such as craft, plant and machinery operatives. This occupational distribution reflects the labour market situation in Inner London in the last few years in which higher level managerial, professional and associate professional occupations have been on the increase while the middle-range skilled jobs have been on the decline. These trends have implications for those seeking employment. In terms of ethnicity, there was a higher proportion within the White and Black community in the higher level managerial and professional occupations while the Bangladeshi were more likely to be in personal, protective and sales occupations. Except for two lower occupations (personal protective services and sales), there was a cluster of young people (15-29) within the three higher occupations (professional, technical and secretarial/clerical) but with the top-most occupation dominated by those in the 30-59 age range. Figure 5.2 shows that the percentage among the male population in the two top occupations was higher than that among the females although this was reversed in the next three occupations. There was a general tendency for more recent and medium residents to be higher level professionals compared to long term residents. These relatively well-qualified recent and medium term residents were more likely to work outside the borough in which they lived.

Figure 5.2: Employment by occupation




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

5.3 Travel to Work Patterns

The household survey suggests that just over half (53%) of all working people in King's Cross worked outside their borough with 27% working within the borough and 19% locally (i.e. within walking distance). The level of commuting was highest within the Black community with 58% working outside the borough closely followed by White (52%). There was a higher level (27%) of people working locally within the Bangladeshi community compared to the White (20%) and Black (8%). These statistics parallel the job-search behaviour we found: among the unemployed Bangladeshis, there were far more people attending interviews locally than in the other two ethnic groups. The commuting pattern was the same across the entire age range. Women employees were proportionally more likely to work locally or within their borough than their male counterparts among whom 57% worked outside the borough compared to 48% for women.

Figure 5.3: Travel to work patterns




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

5.4 Employee/Self-employed


Of the whole population, 87% were working as employees (Figure 5.4). Most of the workers (63%) had no managerial or supervisory responsibilities at all while 33% did have (Figure 5.5). Half (50%) of the working population were in establishments which employed 25 or more people while another 40% worked for employers with less than 25 workers (Figure 5.6).

Figure 5.4: Working as employee/self-employed




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 5.5: Responsibility at work



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 5.6: Size of establishment




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

On the other hand, 12% of the working population was self-employed dominated by recently arrived, White males, aged between 30-59 (Figure 5.4).


While only 37% of the self-employed were working on their own, a significant proportion (57%) of the self-employed had workers. Of those who had workers, the majority (81%) had less than 24 workers and only 19% employed more than 25 people (Figure 5.7). Of the working population, 69% were in full time jobs compared to 30% part time (Figures 5.8). The White population had the highest proportion of people in full time jobs (73%) this was followed by Black people (67%) and the Bangladeshi (53%). The opposite was found to be the case for part time jobs.

Figure 5.7: Size of establishment owned by the self-employed



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


Figure 5.8: Work status



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


While 72% of the whole working population considered their working hours to be enough, only 12% said these were not enough and 15% said their working hours were too much (Figure 5.9). The working population was also asked how many times they had changed jobs in the last two years before the interview. While 71% had not changed jobs at all in the two years before the interview, 16% had done so once and 13% more than once (Figure 5.10). The job experience among the Bangladeshi was more volatile with 47% of their working population having changed jobs more than once in the two years before the interview compared to 29% for the White and 28% for the Black. Job stability was also poor among the 15-29 with 42% changing jobs at least once in the previous two years while the proportion changing jobs among the 30-59 was only 24%. Another significant difference was between the recent arrivals and the established residents. 46% of recent arrivals had moved jobs at least once compared to only 20% for the medium and long-term residents.

Figure 5.9: Views on hours worked



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 5.10: Number of times changed job in last two years




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

6 Health and disability

The focus for poverty alleviation studies and policy in regeneration has tended to concentrate on the registered unemployed at the expense of other groups. If the presence of jobs were enough, all King's Cross residents could be employed. However, there are other reasons for unemployment such as complete disability or sickness and caring responsibilities. Thus the chronically sick, disabled and their carers have suffered relative or absolute impoverishment - and their position is not helped by an emphasis on relieving poverty only, or mainly, in the economically active population. When asked for their opinion on the health of the household over the last twelve months (Figure 6.1), 77% of respondents rated this as good or fairly good, while 17% said it was not good, and 6% rated it poor.

Figure 6.1 : Health of households




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

The percentage of healthy households was marginally higher among Whites (79%) followed by Blacks (74%) with the Bangladeshis at 70%. Long-term residents were more likely to report poor health than recent- or medium-term residents. One explanation could be that among long-term residents are most of the frail elderly people. When analysed by tenure, poor health was prevalent among council tenants with 33% saying that the household health was not good or poor, followed by housing association tenants at 27%. By comparison, owner occupiers and those renting privately enjoyed better health with only 6% reporting their health as not good or poor. Significantly, while 6% of private rent households claimed that the household health was not good, there was none who said it was poor.

Of all households, 29% claimed to have a member with a long-term illness (Figure 6.2). Within the ethnic groups the proportion of households in which there was a member with long-term illness was 25% for the Whites, 39% for the Blacks and 35% for the Bangladeshis. In terms of length of residence, long-term households were twice as likely to have a person with a long-term illness as recent- or medium-term households. Again council residents came out the worst with 38% of households having a member with a long-term illness, followed by those in housing association units at 30%, owner occupiers at 20% and lastly individual private renters at a meagre 3%.

Figure 6.2 : Prevalence of long-term illness



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

We also sought to determine what kind of disability or illness is suffered by the member/s of those households reporting disability.

Table 6.1 : Types and prevalence of long-term illness/disability

Illness/Disability	% of households reporting (100% = all households with any disability)
Breathing problems	30
Heart problems	28
Arthritis	18
Difficulty with limb movement	16
Depression	14

Difficulty in hearing	8
Problem with walking unaided	6
Long-term illness (e.g. Parkinson's)	4
Kidney disease	3
Ill-health/Problems due to old age	3
Mental ill-health	3
Difficulty in seeing	3
Behavioural Problems	3
Learning disability	2
Epilepsy	2
Sickle cell	1
Other diseases	21
No of households = 92	


Note : Percentages do not add up to 100 because some households reported more than one illness.
Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

It was generally found that physical, rather than emotional, ill-health was common in the area. Of the top five illnesses, four related to physical ill-health and only one was of a psychological/emotional nature. It is difficult to be categorical about the reasons for the prevalence of certain illnesses except to say that the relationship between poor housing and physical and emotional health is now widely recognised. For instance, cold living conditions are associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular illnesses, and damp homes with respiratory conditions (ACE, 1999). There are a number of other factors which have a bearing on health for example, the combination of high job demands and low control can contribute to negative psychological outcomes. Conversely, improvements in job-role quality result in decreases in levels of anxiety and depression. Causation can also run the other way, where disability lowers income and thus drives or confines people to poor housing.

Analysing the health profile of different ethnic groups with reference to the top five illnesses only (Figure 6.3), revealed that the White population had the worst profile in three of the five conditions (breathing problems, heart problems and arthritis). In the other two illnesses Black and Bangladeshi households were twice as likely to report difficulties with limb movement as White households. While the worst incidence of depression was among Black households (17%) followed by White households at 14%, it is significant that there wasn't a single case of depression among Bangladeshi households. A possible explanation for the absence of emotional distress among the Bangladeshi may be the strong social network of supports commonly associated with Asian culture. While age is a strong factor in health - and we suspect that this was the reason why the White population which is predominantly old came off the worst - it was not possible to correct for age in our analysis because the question only asked if there was a long-term sick member in the family. Only in a small number of cases (those registered disabled) were we able to analyse by age.

Generally speaking, recent to medium-term residents were more likely to report emotional problems than long-term households who were more likely to report physical problems. The distribution of the top five health complaints across tenure reflects what has already been discussed above. That council tenants and housing association tenants enjoyed poor health was reflected by the range of households (16-33%) and (14-32%) respectively reporting to have at least one person in each group. Owner-occupiers on the other hand only reported having members in two of the five with none for those in privately rented households. While our analysis so far suggests a strong link between council and housing association units with poor health, there are other factors affecting the health of people e.g. household income, age, nature of job, family structure, ethnicity etc.


Figure 6.3 : Prevalence of five main illnesses/disabilities



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

An additional question was asked to estimate the proportions of people excluded from the labour market because of caring for sick or disabled family members. Figure 6.4 shows that 7% of all households had a person staying at home to look after a long-term ill family member. As would be expected, Bangladeshi households with a culture of caring for their old and sick had the highest proportion (22%), compared to 5% within the White households in which such care would more often be provided by some kind of institutional social service.

Figure 6.4 : Caring responsibilities




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

7 Education and children


This section discusses the findings from questions designed to explore household perceptions of the education system in King's Cross. Detailed analyses of the published national school results for the area have also been done and are the subject of two reports (Mujtaba and Sammons, 2001a/b). Education and training have been identified as central to the regeneration of King's Cross from year 1. There were 228 children/dependants (from here onwards only 'children' is used for both) aged below 18 spread through over half of all households sampled in the area. Thirty-nine percent of households had children aged between 0-10 years and 22% had children in the 11-18 age group [Figures 7.1 (a-d)]. The proportion of households with children was found to be considerably higher within the two ethnic minority groups compared to White households. There was also a tendency for households with children to be recent- or medium-term, in council or housing association tenancy, as opposed to long-term residents in owner-occupied housing or private rent.

Figure 7.1a : Households with children aged between 0-4 years.




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 7.1b : Households with children aged between 5-10 years.




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 7.1c : Households with children aged between 11-16 years.



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


Figure 7.1d : Households with children aged between 17-18 years.



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Almost forty percent of all households had children below the age of 11 and these were served by 3 nursery/infant schools, 11 primary schools and 3 secondary schools within the SRB area, referred to here as 'local'. Households with children were asked which school/s their children attended. Up to 41% of the households with school children sent them to a local school, another 24% had children attending schools outside the area (Figure 7.2). In the remaining 35% of cases it is assumed that although they had children under 18 years, these were not in full-time education.


Figure 7.2 : Households with children attending outside school



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


There was a higher proportion (30%) within the White households sending their children outside the area than among Black (25%) and Bangladeshi (18%). The analysis also revealed a concentration of certain ethnic groups towards specific schools (Figures 7.3 and 7.4). For example, Bangladeshi children were more likely to attend South Camden Community School, Elizabeth Garrett Anderson and Argyle. On the other hand, White children were more likely to go to Maria Fidelis Convent School, St Mary's and St Pancras, and St Andrews. Black children tended to go to St Aloysius, Blessed Sacrament and Vittoria.

Figure 7.3 : Households with children attending local primary school



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


Figure 7.4 : Households with children attending local secondary school



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Our survey found that most people who sent their children to a school outside the locality did so not so much because of the poor local schools (a reason given by 11% of households), but usually for other reasons. For instance, 27% cited the good quality of an outside school (without explicitly criticising local ones), and another 20% said it was the nearest school (Figure 7.5). In 21% of all these cases, households had unsuccessfully tried to send their children to a local school before settling for one outside the area.


Figure 7.5 : Reasons for sending children to outside school



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


All households (including those without children) were asked about how happy they were with the quality of education in their area. In each case, 28% were happy or very happy with nursery and primary schools, compared to 9-11% who were not happy (Figures 7.6 and 7.7). Because the question was also asked to households with no children, there was a high proportion of people who did not offer a view (about 60%).

Figure 7.6 : Level of satisfaction with nursery schools



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


Figure 7.7 : Level of satisfaction with primary schools



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

The level of satisfaction was lower for secondary schools and sixth form colleges with only 11-13% saying they were happy (Figure 7.8). In fact there were more people 'not happy' than 'happy' with secondary education.


Figure 7.8 : Level of satisfaction with secondary schools



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

In cases where households had strong views one way or the other, we sought to explore any underlying factors in household views by asking what was it that made households very happy or not with the quality of education. For those very happy with either nursery, primary, secondary or colleges in the area, five single factors (Figure 7.9) were identified.

Figure 7.9 : Reasons for being 'very happy' with schools




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

The two most important factors for those very happy with the quality of education related to staff and the learning experience of the children. Fifty one percent of all households said they were very happy because of good teaching staff, while 28% attributed their satisfaction to the learning experience of the children. Reasons within each ethnic group why households felt very happy with the education system varied significantly. While only 31% of White households cited good teaching staff as a reason, this rose to 50% among Black households and was even higher among the Bangladeshi at 73%. Surprisingly, even though 73% of Bangladeshi families reported good teaching staff, only 9% gave 'children learn a lot' as a reason for their satisfaction, compared with 60% for Blacks and 24% for Whites. This low proportion among Bangladeshis might be the result of poor interaction between the children and parents - a situation where school experiences are failing to filter through to the parents at home. The level of satisfaction was higher with those recently arrived and medium-term residents.

On the other hand six single factors were identified among those not at all happy (Figure 7.10). The strongest factor was the low education standards (28%) followed by lack of discipline at school (19%). Medium to long-term residents were more likely to be unhappy on a number of factors compared to recent arrivals whose main sources of unhappiness were poor communication between the home and school, lack of discipline and poor educational standards (although on this last factor the proportion was lower than that for medium and long-term residents).


Figure 7.10 : Reasons for being 'not at all happy' with schools



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Ninety-five percent of all respondents said that it was very important to get a good education, 4% said it was fairly important and only 1% said it was not very important. (Figure 7.11).


Figure 7.11 : Views on importance of education



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

As to the three most cited reasons why respondents thought that it was very important to get a good education, the most common one was 'good job prospects' (60%) followed by 'personal development' (37%) and 'be able to make informed choices' (21%). Eighty-one percent of Bangladeshi households thought that education was important for a job, compared to 62% Black and 56% White. In addition to good job prospects, White and Black households were more likely to view education as an additional tool for personal development much more than Bangladeshi households who were more likely to think of it as a help to social acceptance. A higher proportion (64%) of council and housing association tenants regarded education as very important for a job in comparison to 51% owner-occupiers and 46% private-renters.


Figure 7.12 : Views on why a good education is important



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Of all households with dependants aged 18 or under, 38% reported dependants on Free School Meals (FSM) (Figure 7.13). Sixty-two percent Bangladeshi and 45% Black households had one or more dependants on FSM compared to 28% White. The highest proportion of these were either council (48%) or Housing Association tenants (37%).

Figure 7.13 : Households with children on Free School Meals



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

The analysis of national assessment results is the subject of two detailed reports as stated above. However, a brief statement of these results is set out below.

Table 7.1 : Percentage of pupils gaining 5 or more A-C GCSEs and Truancy rates.

School	GCSE 1997	GCSE 2000	Truancy 2000
Maria Fidelis Convent School	58	47	2
South Camden Community School	21	25	5
Elizabeth Garrett Anderson	28	32	3
Camden Average	48	51	2
Islington Average	25	27	2
National Average	45	49	1
Inner London Average		36	

Source : The Independent, 7 December 2000.

Maria Fidelis was above the inner London average but had slipped below the national average (49% in 2000). South Camden and EGA had both improved their pass-rates, but remained below the Inner London and national average level. There were also improvement in terms of the reduction in the percentage of students leaving with no qualifications (Table 7.2).

Table 7.2 : Percentage of pupils with no GCSE passes

School	1997	2000
Maria Fidelis Convent School	6	7

South Camden Community School	19	11
Elizabeth Garrett Anderson	9	2
Camden Average	9	6
Islington Average	14	8
National Average	8	6

Source : The Independent, 7 December 2000.

It can be seen from Table 7.3 that there was a general improvement in both English and maths performance between 1997 and 2000 in most of the primary schools in the Kings Cross area. In interpreting this the impact of the National Literacy (1997) and National Numeracy strategies (1998) must be noted.

**Table 7.3 : Percentage of pupils achieving level 4 at key stage 2
Year 2000 (with 1997 in brackets)**

School	English	Maths	Science
Edith Neville Primary School	(32) 58	(27) 54	(18) 58
St. Mary and St. Pancras Church of England School	(73)73	(73)62	(77)81
St. Aloysius Roman Catholic Junior School	(60)78	(70)73	(72)88
Richard Cobden primary School	(43) 51	(43)56	(40)69
Argyle Primary School	(57)68	(78)77	(93)86
Blessed Sacrament Junior Roman Catholic School	(56)88	(48)83	(72)92
Copenhagen Junior School	(49)45	(58)41	(56)50
Vittoria Junior School	(32)56	(44)60	(20)72
Winton Junior School	(74)78	(74)69	(48)72
Angel Junior School*	50	59	77
St. Andrews Church of England Junior School	(60)73	(73)50	(80)85
Camden Average	(62)72	(68)71	(72)83
Islington Average	(57)69	(58)67	(65)81
National Average	(63)75	(61)72	(68)85
Inner London	68	65	78

*NB there was no record of Angel school for 1997 in performance tables


Source : The Independent, 7 December 2000.

8 Crime and Security

8.1 Feelings about crime and safety

Households were asked questions soliciting views and information on their feelings about crime. The questions related to the general area but also specifically to their housing estate or street. Using a Likert scale categorisation of responses, households were invited to state their agreement or disagreement to a number of statements. Of all households, 58% disagreed with the statement that 'it is safe to walk through the AREA at night', while 36% agreed that it was safe (Figure 8.1).


Figure 8.1 : Feelings about safety of area at night



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Seventy-six percent disagreed with the statement that 'all STREETS in the area are safe to walk through at night' compared to only 15% who agreed with the statement (Figure 8.2).


Figure 8.2 : Feelings about safety of streets in the area at night



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Households felt more safe during the day with 84% agreeing with the statement that 'it is safe to walk in the AREA during the day' as opposed to only 14% who disagreed (Figure 8.3).


Figure 8.3 : Feelings about safety of the area during the day



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

However, this positive view about the safety of the general area during the day did not apply to particular streets because a lower proportion (63% compared to 84% for AREA) agreed with the statement that 'all STREETS in this area are safe to walk through during the day' while 30% disagreed (Figure 8.4). What this suggests is the actual or perceived existence of localised crime prone areas.


Figure 8.4 : Feelings about safety of the streets during the day



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

What was puzzling and disturbing was the greater sense of insecurity people had at home in the night than on the street during the day. Proportionately more people thought that it was safe out on the street in the area during the day (Figures 8.3 and 8.4) than in their own homes at night (Figure 8.5).


Figure 8.5 : Feelings about safety in the home at night



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

The area was judged as not safe to live in by 51% of households compared to 42% who said it was safe (Figure 8.6).


Figure 8.6 : Feelings about safety in the area as a place to live in



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Respondents were asked to compare their area with other surrounding areas and state how safe it was by comparison. Taking into account all households, twenty-six percent reckoned that their area was safer, and 30% thought it was less safe while 35% said it was about the same as other surrounding areas (Figure 8.7).

Figure 8.7 : Safety of local area compared with surrounding areas



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

In cases where households had very strong opinions, these were further explored by asking why they thought that the local area was comparatively much safe or much less safe. Of those who thought the local area was much safe, a sense of community and police presence were the most cited reasons followed by CCTV cameras and good lighting, all four in that order (Table 8.1). These findings challenge the preoccupation with CCTV cameras and good lighting as public measures in combating crime and building confidence in the community. Unless criminals are aware that CCTV cameras are monitored and have witnessed convictions on the strength of CCTV imagery, this will not act as a deterrent against criminal activities and does little for community confidence. Although improved street lighting may prevent certain crimes, a recent study on Swinton Town Centre (Awuor, 2001) found that street lighting improvements exacerbated rather than deterred youth crime and vandalism. Below is a list of comments to do with 'community' as a source of security.

Table 8.1 : Comments alluding to a sense of 'community' as a source of security

1. There are always people in the square and we know each other
2. Community knows and looks after each other
3. Very nice people
4. This is a small community and we have a neighbourhood watch
5. There is a sense of it being well maintained by the people who live here. People take collective responsibility and don't tolerate bad behaviour
6. People are good to each other

7. It is away from the main road and houses are enclosed
8. Neighbours look out for each other and we know each other
9. People know us and we know them, they see us and talk to us

Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

On the other hand people who rated their area as much less safe cited a number of reasons among which the often repeated were: drugs, prostitution, street violence, youth gangs in that order. The full list is shown in Table 8.2. Notice that the lack of CCTV cameras and poor lighting did not feature prominently as negating the sense of security. For all the talk and investments to put more police on the beat, CCTV cameras and street lighting, it is the sense of 'community' which seems to be more effective in building security confidence in the area.


Table 8.2 : Reasons why people feel unsafe

Reason	No of mentions
Run down character	2
Poor lighting	6
Drunkards (joint fourth)	5
Drug dealing (joint first)	16
Prostitution (joint fourth)	5
Youth Gangs	12
Lack of police	3
No CCTV	3
Physical Violence (joint first)	16
Thieves	2
Other	11

Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Households were asked to look back over the last 4 years (1996-2000) - spanning the period of regeneration activity in the area to date - and say to what extent they thought that the area had changed in the level of crime. Although this question was asked of all households, the discussion is based on an analysis of those cases in which the respondent had been resident in the area for 5 or more years. This condition enabled us to exclude recent arrivals. Twenty-four percent said that it had got safer compared to 31% who thought the area had got less safe while 38% claimed that it has remained the same (Figure 8.8). A higher proportion of ethnic minority residents (32% Black and 53% Bangladeshi) thought that the area had got safer than did White residents (19%). When the length of stay was taken into account, only 23% long term residents thought that the area had got safer compared to 28% of medium term residents. The picture which emerged was that long term residents were more negative about the area compared to medium term residents. Although reporting the highest feeling of insecurity at home (see above), the proportion of people saying that the area had got safer was highest among council residents (27%) followed by owners and private renters (25%) and housing association (15%). When analysed according to age group, the feeling that the area had got safer was highest in the 15-29 age group (48%) low in the 60+ (25%) and lower still in the 30-59 age group (19%). A slightly higher level of men (28%) reported improved safety compared to 22% among the women.

Figure 8.8 : Feelings about changes in safety in the last 4 years



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

As with the previous question, those expressing strong views on changes in the level of crime in the last 4 years, were further asked why they thought that the area had got a lot safer or got much less safe. You will recall above that a sense of community rather than public measures was important in assuring households of the safety of their area over other surrounding areas. Interestingly, public measures rather than a sense of community were the crucial factors contributing to a feeling of improved safety in the area over the last 4 years. Notice in Table 8.3 that the most common reason was CCTV cameras followed by police presence, good lighting in that order. There was no mention of community sense. When an area was being compared with surrounding areas, people valued their familiarity with the people and area as sources of security. When the area was compared with itself over a period of time, households, presumably still valued the community sense but tended to rely more on public measures - CCTV, Police, Lighting - as signs of improved security.

Table 8.3 : Reasons for improved safety in the last 4 years

Reason	No of mentions
Community sense	0
Good lighting	1
Police presence	4
CCTV	6

Other 7

Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Those reporting that the area had got much less safe frequently cited drugs, followed by violence and lack of police on the beat (Table 8.4). Nearly all the reasons on why the area had got much less safe were given by White households, who on the whole, were less positive about the security of the area.


Table 8.4 : Reasons for declining safety in the last 4 years

Reason	No of mentions
Drunk people	2
Drug users	17
Prostitutes	5
Youth gangs	4
Lack of police on the beat	7
No CCTV in the area	1
Poor lighting	0
Physical violence	10
Thefts	4
People don't know each other	2
Other	9

Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

It was considered necessary to examine and compare feelings about crime for the whole area and also for the particular housing estate or street on which respondents lived. Households were asked to think about their own street or housing estate and to state how they felt about going out in the day time. Of all households, 90% felt safe (safe/fairly safe) with only 8% stating that they felt unsafe (a little unsafe/very unsafe) (Figure 8.9).


Figure 8.9 : Feelings about safety of street/estate during the day



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Asked about their feelings when using communal stairs on the estate, 64% said they felt safe compared to 16% who felt unsafe (Figure 8.10).


Figure 8.10 : Feelings about safety of communal stairs at home



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


Notice that twice as many people felt unsafe using communal stairs in their estate as did going out during the day. This is perhaps not surprising, some respondents had said that communal stairs were sometimes being used by drug addicts. This question did not apply to about 20% of households who lived in houses with no communal stairs. Asked about how they felt when alone at home after dark, 77% said that they felt safe with 21% feeling unsafe (Figure 8.11).

Figure 8.11 : Feelings about safety at home in the night



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

While 90% felt safe going out in the daytime (Figure 8.9), the proportion fell to 77% when respondents were asked how they felt alone at home in the night. Feelings about safety fell lower still when respondents were asked about walking alone in their street or around the estate after dark with only 42% saying that they felt safe compared to 50% who felt unsafe (Figure 8.12).
 Figure 8.12 : Feelings about safety when alone after dark around the estate or walking in 'own' street.



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Further probing revealed that those who felt safe (as opposed to unsafe or fairly safe), attributed this primarily to a sense of community (notice once again how important 'community' was to the feeling of safety), then to good security locks, the presence of lots of people, good lighting etc (Table 8.5).

Table 8.5 : Reasons for feeling safe about the street/estate

Reason for feeling safe	Number of times reason mentioned
1. Peaceful neighbours/community sense/know people	55
2. Good security locks	47
3. Lots of people around	44
4. Good lighting	38
5. Can take care of myself	29
6. Police presence in the area	28
7. No experience of crime	27
8. CCTV cameras	14
9. Other	25

Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

The two most common reasons for feeling unsafe were drug dealing and physical violence, followed by youth gangs, poor lighting etc (Table 8.6).

Table 8.6 : Reasons for feeling unsafe about the street/estate

Reason for feeling unsafe	Number of times reason mentioned
---------------------------	----------------------------------

1. Drug dealing	16
2. Physical violence	16
3. Youth gangs	12
4. Poor lighting	6
5. Drunkards	5
6. Prostitution	5
7. Lack of police	3
8. No CCTV cameras	3
9. Thieves	2
10. Blight	2
11. Other	11

Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


Notice that the presence of a lot of ordinary people going about their own business was a source of security for a number of people (Table 8.5), but groups of youths loitering around evoked fear (Table 8.6).

On the whole, the feeling of safety was higher within the Bangladeshi community followed by Black. Those feeling insecure tended to be White, long-term or recent households and generally female.

8.2 Actual behaviour

People may feel one way about crime but behave in a different way. It was considered important to find out how, if at all, feelings about crime affected their behaviour. Overall, 61% reported that they went out alone at night and 39% did not (Figure 8.13).

Figure 8.13 : Going out alone at night



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Within the broad ethnic groups the proportions of people who went out alone at night were: White - 62%; Black - 58%; and Bangladeshi - 42%. Although ethnic minority groups felt positive about the safety of the area, they were less likely to go out alone at night compared to their white counterparts who felt less positive. Here is a case where people felt one way about crime but behaved in another way. While the ethnic minority response to going out at night did not reflect their positive attitude, consistent with their views on the area, recent and medium term residents were more likely to go out than long term residents. By tenure, a greater percentage (87%) of private renters and 70% of owners ventured out alone at night followed by housing association tenants (65%) and council tenants (49%). The proportion of people who went out alone at night diminished with age from 78% for 15-29 year olds to 35% for the over 60s. Invariably the ratio of those who went out alone at night was low among women 47% and high (78%) among men. At 40% overall, this was a big increase from 1994 when only 17% said they never went out at night (MORI POLL). A number of reasons can be offered to try and explain this increase in the proportion of people staying in at night...

The area might actually have become less safe; Population evolution has led to an increase in groups of people who do not feel safe alone at night (elderly, vulnerable ethnic groups etc...); and the inclusion of 'alone' in our question may have compounded the sense of insecurity.

People did not go out at night for a number of reasons (Table 8.7), but the most common was that they never felt safe.

Table 8.7 : Reasons for not going out alone at night


Reason for not going out alone at night	Number of times reason mentioned
---	----------------------------------

1. I don't feel safe	59
2. No reason for going out	37
3. Looking after family	11
4. Health reasons	6
5. Other	4

Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Asked if they went out alone during the day, 97% said 'yes' with only 3% saying 'no' (Figure 8.14).

Figure 8.14 : Going out alone during the day




Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Of the few that did not go out during the day, the one most important reason was ill health. On the whole, it did not appear that people's feelings about crime affected behaviour. White households felt more negative about crime in the area but a greater proportion went out at night than ethnic minority groups who felt more positive. Generally, there were more people going out at night than had expressed negative feelings about security.

8.3 Actual experience of crime

In addition to soliciting respondents' feelings and behaviour on crime and safety, households were also asked about their actual experience as victims of crime. It was important to examine the relationship between fear of crime with actual crime. After all, it is often argued that fear of crime is more of a problem than actual crime. While 51% of all households had had some experience of crime, 49% had no experience at all (Figure 8.15).

Figure 8.15 : Household experience of crime



Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

When disaggregated according to ethnicity, the experience of crime was higher within the White households (58%) and lower within the other two ethnic groups (32%). The high experience of crime among the Whites might serve to explain the negative feelings discussed earlier. Was the crime level experienced by Whites disproportionate to their population? To answer this question it was necessary to examine crime levels across the three main ethnicities rather than within. It does appear from Table 8.8, that White households were disproportionately represented among those households experiencing crime. Although forming 62% of all sampled households, they accounted for 71% of households experiencing crime.

Table 8.8 : Proportion of sample households and their experience of crime

Ethnic group	% of households in sample	% of all households experiencing crime.
White	62	71
Black	14	9
Bangladeshi	9	6
N	323	162

Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Figure 8.15 further shows that while 46% of recent households had some experience of crime, the proportion rose to 50% for long term and 57% for medium term residents. According to tenure, the experience of crime was highest within those in housing association units (63%) then followed by owners (61%) and then council tenants (43%).

Of the households who had experienced crime, 72% had reported the crime to the authorities and 28% had not. The level of reporting was highest within Bangladeshi households (78%) followed

by White households (72%) and lowest among Black households (53%). Medium and long term residents were more likely to report a crime than recent arrivals. By tenure, owner-occupiers were slightly more likely to report crimes than other tenure groups. The remaining 28% victims of crime who had not reported mainly thought that the crime was not serious enough, or that it was a waste of time (Table 8.9).

Table 8.9 : Reason for not reporting crime

Reason for not reporting crime	Number of times reason mentioned
1. Crime not serious enough	14
2. Waste of time	12
3. Police not helpful	7
4. Could not prove who did it	3
5. Other reasons	12

Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Information was also sought on specific crime experiences. In order to establish location and changes in the level of experiences of crime, households with victims of were asked to state when and where these crimes had taken place (Table 8.10). In order that the analysis between those households experiencing crime within the last 4 years and before that might be comparable, only those cases in which respondents had a duration of more than 4 years were selected.

Table 8.10 : Type of crime experienced in King's Cross and when

Crime experienced	Within last 4 years in King's Cross (% of all Households)	Before that in King's Cross (% of all Households)
Mugged or robbed	6	1
Deliberately assaulted	4	1
Threatened	10	0
Verbally attacked due to race or colour	5	2
Physically attacked due to race or colour	2	1
Abused because of disability/sexuality	1	0
Sent something nasty through the letter box	1	1
House broken into	7	8
Car broken into or damaged	11	3
Car stolen	3	1
Bicycle stolen or damaged	4	2
Other crime	4	1

Source: King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Except for burglary, the proportion of households who had experienced other specified crime between 1996-2000 in King's Cross was higher than before. More significantly, while no household reported a member threatened before 1996, by the year 2000, ten percent of households had a member who had been threatened. There were also marked increases in the proportion of households with cars being broken into or damaged and muggings or robbery.

An analysis of victim households by ethnicity revealed that White households were more likely to suffer from theft related crimes either burglary/theft from person, house, car or theft of car/bicycle. On the other hand, Bangladeshi, and to a less extent Black households were more likely to suffer violence against the person (physical and verbal attacks, assaults, threatenings etc) (Statistical Appendix). The incidence of mugging or robbery was particularly high (29%) within households in privately rented units represented mainly by recently arrived, young (15-29 years) White


population. Within the owner-occupiers there was a high incidence of theft from car or damage to car (20%) (Statistical Appendix).

On the whole, it did not appear that people's feelings about crime affected behaviour (section 8.2). But, neither were the general feelings consistent with experience of crime. Broadly speaking, there was a higher proportion of households who had experienced crime compared to the proportion who reported feeling unsafe. Disaggregated at the level of ethnicity however, we found a consistency in feeling and experience. White households had the highest crime experience and the most negative profile of feelings about crime. On the other hand, Bangladeshi households had the least experiences of crime and a more positive profile of feelings about crime.

9 Income and Benefits

Except for 7%, all households were willing to give us estimates of their total gross household income, and the results appear fairly dramatic (Figure 9.1).

Figure 9.1 : Annual gross household income




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Forty-nine percent of all households reported income of less than £10,350 per year (less than £200 per week); only 17% reported incomes over £26,000 (over £500 per week). The proportion of households earning more than £26,000 was high among Whites (19%) compared to 4% for Black and 5% Bangladeshi households. Recent followed by medium-term residents had marginally higher proportions of households earning more than £26,000. At the lower end of the scale and disaggregated on tenure, the level of households with incomes less than £10,350 was highest among council tenants (68%) followed by Housing association tenants (44%), owners (33%) and private renters (15%).

However, global percentages tell us nothing about the level of income compared to the size of household and can hide extreme differences within the sample and therefore be misleading. For this reason, it was decided to calculate the per capita income (income per person in the household). Using per capita income, it was immediately apparent that household incomes had smoothed out the huge income differences between ethnic groups (Figure 9.2). Looking at the lower end, only 17% of White households had a weekly per capita income of less than £60, this proportion rose to 41% among Black households and was 68% within the Bangladeshi households. At the other end, 35% of White households had a weekly per capita income of over £200 compared to 5% for Black and Bangladeshi households. Differences in per capita income were more pronounced with ethnicity than on other variables owing to the combination of low

household incomes and comparatively large households among ethnic minority groups - particularly Bangladeshis.

Figure 9.2 : Household weekly per capita income



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Households were asked about their sources of income: and many had multiple incomes coming into the house – salaries, pensions and various kinds of benefits. Among the 297 households replying, 653 income sources were reported. Interestingly two thirds of the mentions were of state benefits or pensions of one kind or another, while only a third of the mentions were of employment incomes or occupational pensions. See Figure 9.3 overleaf.


This first analysis does suggest that poverty in the area may be due more to benefit levels than to earnings levels.

10 The King's Cross Partnership

In this part of the survey, we sought to discover the level of awareness of the King's Cross Partnership and its activities. When asked if they had known of the SRB programme before the interview, 41% of all residents said that they had, while 59% had not (Figure 10.1).

Proportionally more (47%) White households were aware of SRB followed by 38% Black households and 15% Bangladeshi. The level of awareness of the SRB programme was high within the owner-occupied and private rented sector. Sixty-six percent of owner-occupiers and 45% of private renters had known about the SRB programme compared to 38% housing association tenants and 34% of council tenants.


Figure 10.1 : Awareness of the King's Cross SRB programme



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Knowledge about the Kings Cross Partnership (as distinct from the SRB) was marginally higher with 44% saying that they knew about it compared to 56% who did not (Figure 10.2). Although Black households were more likely to be aware of the SRB programme than the Bangladeshi, they were the least informed about the existence of the Partnership with only 30% saying they knew about the Partnership's existence compared to 38% of Bangladeshis. Again knowledge about the Partnership was highest within the White community with 50% of households saying they knew about it. While knowledge about the Partnership was marginally higher for council (40%) and housing association tenants (44%) compared to private renters (36%), owner-occupiers at 68% were most likely to know about it.


Figure 10.2 : Awareness of the King's Cross Partnership



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

The Partnership produces a newsletter for distribution to households. Respondents were shown the newsletter and asked if they had seen or read it. Fifty percent of all respondents said that they had not seen it, while 16% had only seen it and 34% had read it (Figure 10.3). White households were most likely to have read the newsletter followed by Black. Bangladeshi households were least likely to have read the newsletter. Analysed by tenure, it was once again owner-occupier households who showed the highest interest in reading the newsletter, followed by housing association with the least interest coming from the private renters.


Figure 10.3 : Awareness of Partnership Newsletter



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Those reporting to have read the newsletter were further asked about the effectiveness of the newsletter in informing them about what was going on in the area (Figure 10.4). Twenty percent of these readers rated it as very effective, another 42% said that it was fairly effective and 16% thought that it was not effective. White and Black households rated the newsletter more highly than did Bangladeshi. Although comparatively few in absolute numbers, the proportions of respondents rating the newsletter as effective was highest among private renters, followed by owner-occupiers. Council and housing association tenants were more harsh in their judgement of the effectiveness of the newsletter.


Figure 10.4 : Effectiveness of Partnership Newsletter



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Finally in this section we asked respondents which of the Partnership activities they were aware of. Identified activities were grouped under 5 headings (Figure 10.5). Most respondents were aware of Partnership activity to improve the general environment, this was followed by housing improvements, and support for small business. Partnership's efforts at improving education came in at fourth place ahead of job creation which was in last place.

Figure 10.5 : Awareness of Partnership activities



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000


11 Perception of change between 1996-2000

The Partnership strategic objective on enhancing the quality of life is over-arching, being linked to employment status, attractiveness of the area, safety and social facilities. Instead of relying on physical measures related to numbers of facilities, level of usage, GP/Patient ratios etc, which do not necessarily translate to quality of life, people's own perceptions about changes in the area from 1996 to 2000 were solicited in the survey. This analysis was limited to all long term residents and only those medium term residents who had been living in the area for 5-9 years.

Changes in employment prospects

Unemployment is one key indicator of the level of poverty and deprivation - and hence quality of life - in an area. Respondents were asked to state whether employment prospects had changed for the better, got worse or stayed the same in the last 4 years (Figure 11.1). Overall, 19% stated that employment prospects had improved compared to 11% who claimed that they had got worse. A significant 29% stated that the situation had not changed with an even greater percentage (40%) expressing no opinion at all. When these responses were analysed within each ethnic group, the Bangladeshi community were more positive with 40% saying that employment prospects had improved compared to only 10% for the Blacks and 13% for the Whites.

Figure 11.1 : Perception of change in employment prospects




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Changes in availability of job training

On the availability of job training (Figure 11.2) 24% of all respondents said that this had improved compared to only 5% who said it had got worse. While only 16% said that this had remained the

same, 56% said they did not know making it the one aspect on which the majority of respondents could not offer an opinion. This is so despite the Partnership's focus on training programmes through Tracks Towards Employment - a centre providing advice, guidance, basic skills and training support to help residents access further training, education and employment.

Figure 11.2 : Perception of change in availability of job training




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Changes in education

Education is a big factor in shaping people's quality of life as it has a determining influence on life chances/opportunities. When respondents were asked if they thought that the standard of education available had changed (Figure 11.3), 15% reported that things had changed for the better, while 16% said it had changed for the worse with 26% claiming it had remained the same and an overwhelming 43% said that they did not know. There were again proportionately more households within the Bangladeshi (40%) claiming that educational standards had improved compared to only 16% Black households and 13% of the White households.

Figure 11.3 : Perception of change in educational standards




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Changes in access to shopping

Households were also asked to give their opinions on the changes in access to, and quality of, shopping (Figure 11.4). Unlike in the earlier three questions on employment, education and training in which many households remained ambivalent, most households had an opinion on shopping. 36% of all households said that it had improved compared to only 14% who said it had got worse, but the largest proportion (44%) said it had remained the same and only 5% offered no opinion. Although King's Cross still lacks any substantial stores (in size) and also any mid-range or up-market multiple traders compared to the adjoining areas (Upper Street, Camden Town, Brunswick and western Bloomsbury) a surprisingly high proportion of households thought that access to, and quality of, shopping had improved in the last four years. Yet again rather more (60%) Bangladeshi households thought that shopping access and quality had improved compared to Black (42%) and White (30%) households.

Figure 11.4 : Perception of change in access to, and quality of, shopping




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Changes in housing conditions

The improvement of housing is another important social objective in the ongoing regeneration programme in King's Cross. Among all households, 32% responded that the quality of housing conditions had improved, with only 16% considering they had worsened and another 41% claiming it had remained the same (Figure 11.5). The level of satisfaction with housing improvement was marginally highest among Whites followed by Black households with the Bangladeshis being the least satisfied. In terms of length of stay, medium and long term residents were more satisfied than the recent arrivals.

Figure 11.5 : Perception of change in housing conditions




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Changes in inter-ethnic relations

The ethnic minority groups represent a considerable proportion of the population in the SRB area and tensions have sometimes arisen between different ethnic groups. Respondents were asked whether they thought race relations had changed for the better, got worse or stayed the same (Figure 11.6). Among all households, more people (23%) said that ethnic relations had improved in the last 4 years than that they had worsened (17%). A significant 43% said that there had been no change and 17% that they didn't know. While only 19% of White households perceived improvements in race relations, the proportion was marginally higher among Blacks (21%) and was much higher among the Bangladeshis (63%). There was also a significant gender difference with more than twice as many male respondents as female reporting improvements in racial harmony.

Figure 11.6 : Perception of change in race relations




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Changes in leisure facilities

As to their perceptions of changes in leisure, entertainment and sports facilities in King's Cross (Figure 11.7), 24% respondents said these had improved compared to 12% who said they had worsened. Again substantially more people (36%) reported no changes while 28% said they did not know.

Figure 11.7 : Perception of change in leisure, entertainment and sports facilities




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Changes in Health facilities

Our survey showed that 34% thought health care facilities had improved and 10% thought that they had deteriorated, 51% thought they had remained the same and 6% offered no opinion. A notably high (55%) proportion of Bangladeshi households reported improvements compared to 34% of White and 33% of Black respondents.

Figure 11.8 : Perception of change in health care facilities




Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

Changes in the overall attractiveness of the area

A question on the attractiveness of the area (Figure 11.9) revealed that households had some strong views with 41% reporting that the area had improved compared to 20% who thought it had deteriorated and 35% considering that it had remained the same. Only 4% did not have an opinion.

Figure 11.9 : Perception of change in overall attractiveness of area



Source : King's Cross Household Survey, 2000

The general picture of perceived changes in environment and quality of life among residents in King's Cross was that, although most people thought that the situation had not changed in the last 4 years, comparatively more people reported improvements than deterioration.

References

(mostly to follow)

Ermisch, J. and Francesconi, M., 2001. The effect of parent's employment on children's lives. Family Policy Studies Centre. Summary on <http://www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/socialpolicy/321.htm> site visited on 14 March 2001.

Green, A. and Owen, D., 1998. Where are the jobless? Changing unemployment and non-employment in cities and regions. The Policy Press. Summary on <http://www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/socialpolicy/spr408.htm> site visited on 14 Dec.2000

Rugg, J., Rhodes, D. and Jones, A., 2000. The nature and impact of student demand on housing markets. YPS. Summary on <http://www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/housing/d60.htm> site visited on 20 Dec.2000

Thomas, R. 2000. Measuring Unemployment at a Local Level - Problems, How not to do it, Possibilities. Notes for Local Economic Policy Unit Seminar, South Bank University.

Appendix 1

The Resident(s)

«Sub_House_Name» «House_Name»

«House_Number» «Street»

«Town» «Post_Code»

Dear Resident(s)

Study of changes in the area round King's Cross

We shall shortly be calling on you seeking to interview you as part of a major research project about social, economic and environmental conditions in this area.

This is not market research and we are not selling anything. It is a study designed to evaluate the effects of public policy and other changes in the area and to help in the formation of policy in the future.

The research is supported by the Kings Cross Partnership (which includes the Boroughs of Camden and Islington among its members) but is being carried out by the University to guarantee both its independence and the absolute confidentiality of the information being gathered: what you tell us in the interview will be entirely confidential to our research team and will not be passed on to any government or other body or person.

n

A trained interviewer will call on you in the next week or two, seeking either to talk to you then or to make an appointment to come back at a more convenient time. He or she will carry an identify card and will show it to you. If you have any doubts about them, or about whether you want to take part, please do phone us at the above number. You are welcome to phone for an appointment if you like.

We have chosen a careful random sample of addresses and the reliability of the survey depends on the cooperation of those selected. We cannot substitute others if some selected households decline to take part.

We'll be very happy to send you our results, and you can find out more about our work by looking at our web site at your local library:

www.bartlett.ucl.ac.uk/courses/kx/

Yours sincerely,

Michael Edwards, Project Director
Dr Emmanuel Mutale, Research Fellow